

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #9

Date: March 24, 2004

The ninth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on March 24, 2004 at the Eastridge Mall Community Room at 7:00 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Creek), Chris Corpus (Charrette participant, KONA), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Garth Cummings (Charrette participant), Gordon Lund (Groesbeck), H. Johal (Sikh Temple), Homing Yip (Evergreen Hills Resident Action Group), Ike White (Mt. Pleasant), Khanh Nguyen (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Lillian Jones (Charrette participant), Lou Kvitek (Silver Creek Valley Community Organization), Maria Lopez (Charrette participant, Meadowfair), Mark Milioto (Evergreen Little League), Mike Alvarado (Charrette participant), Paul Pereira (Boggini), Rick Caton (Charrette participant), Scott Nickle (Charrette participant), Steve Moore (Evergreen Valley Church), Steve Tedesco (Charrette participant, Boys & Girls Club), Sylvia Alvarez (Charrette participant, EESD Trustee), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Victor Klee (Charrette participant), Vikki Lang (Alternate, ELL), Vince Songcayawon (EBPA)

Members of the Public: Jim Lightbody (VTA), Julie Render (VTA), Marty Shelton, Paul & Kathy Antl, Katja Irvin, Lino Legaspi

Development Community: Patrick Spillane, Jeff McMullen, Gerry De Young, Bo Radanovich, Myron Crawford, Manny Gonzalez, Dean Isaacs, Frank Duino, Tom Armstrong

Staff: PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti, PBCE Senior Planner Britta Buys, Rabia Chaudhry, Bonnie Moss, Anh Nguyen, Richard Keit (RDA Director for Neighborhood and Business Services), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Suzanne Wolf (PRNS)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and asked for everyone to introduce himself or herself. He then commented on the importance of starting these meetings promptly at 7PM. Today's discussion definitely needs to end by 8:50pm to allow for a brief presentation by Bonnie Moss on outreach strategies.

II. LAND USE CONCEPTS

PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti commented that there was much that needed to be accomplished at this meeting and asked Mark Day to begin.

Housing Concepts

Day commented that he felt it important that the Task Force members understand the concept of density as used by planners and architects. He explained that there are three types of density:

- Gross acreage - total area within the property lines of a lot before dedication of streets, sidewalks, etc.
- Net acreage - total area within the property lines of a lot after dedication of streets, sidewalks, etc.
- Net/net acreage - eliminates all streets, etc., including those that are private (this is used by the City of San Jose for planning purposes)

Day proceeded to show the group the types of housing associated with various levels of density (high, medium-high, medium-low, medium, etc)

Discussion of Refined Concepts for Campus Industrial Sites

Day displayed to the group the two revised concepts for the campus industrial sites:

Alternative B puts higher density homes along the street and lower density homes along the base of the hills. In this way, fewer people are driving back into the neighborhood.

This alternative contains eclectic homes, various prices and more smart growth principles.

Alternative C is generally lower density. These homes could be within a gated community and there is an opportunity to explore trails going up into the hills.

Prevetti commented that part of this overall exercise is to understand the possibilities in the types of housing and how they might connect with what is west of the area. With both versions, most of the homes would be owned and market-rate. There would be no affordable housing. Both versions also attempt to show diversity in housing types while still allowing a consistent transition from what is currently in the Evergreen Specific Plan. She noted that currently version B does not contain much green space. Naturally the design would be revisited to insert park space and the amenities.

Task Force member Dan Jacobs asked why neither of these designs would allow for affordable housing. Prevetti replied that the median income for a family of four in Santa Clara County is about \$104,000, making affordability of these homes difficult. Furthermore, while the city does contribute to the construction of affordable housing, it is usually rental units because those yield more vacancies than single family homes.

Cortese asked what the city's perspective is on mixing rental units with units for sale. What would the City of San Jose like to see and why did the two version created by Day only show ownership? Prevetti said that there are ways to introduce rental units into ownership neighborhoods. Carriage homes are one example of such. The City feels strongly in mixing housing but it needs to be done in a way that works for the neighborhood. Day added that these plans would also likely produce the most amenities. There are other opportunity sites as part of this Visioning Project and hopefully the sum total of the housing development will allow for a broader variety.

Task Force member Alan Covington commented that version B would likely produce more traffic than version and asked how this would be dealt with. Prevetti responded that once we work through all of the opportunity sites we can then crunch the numbers and know better what traffic issues we're dealing with.

Member of the public Lino Legaspi asked Prevetti if there have been any studies of run-off, hydrology and seismic issues. Prevetti responded that we're at the beginning of the planning process and so these studies have not yet been performed. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will address these issues.

Task Force member Homing Yip commented that he felt the densities in both versions were still too high, because these new sites are still lesser in acreage than the ESP and the lot sizes will be smaller. Day said that version B is really just a continuation of what is already in the ESP. Prevetti said that staff could return with a version that better melds what is in versions B and C and accounts for the concerns about high density, packing too much into a small area, creating narrow streets, etc. The traffic analysis will also help refine the number of housing units because it will dictate how much capacity the streets can hold.

Task Force member Sylvia Alvarez asked if version B could contain a town square concept (similar to the Evergreen Village Square in the ESP). She would like to see more places to walk to commingled with the housing units, similar to how the community policing facility was located so close to the homes at Rivermark. She would also like to see an SJPD presence on the Arcadia property. Prevetti responded that staff decided not to represent a small retail node on the industrial properties because we already know that the Evergreen Village Square is not doing well. Ideally, people who reside on the industrial properties will patronize the Evergreen Village Square.

Task Force member Victor Klee asked if the industrial sites are within the boundaries of the ESP. Prevetti responded no, that they were just outside the border.

Task Force member Garth Cummings asked for the distance from the greenline to San Felipe Road. This would give the Task Force an idea as to the true walk-ability from these proposed new homes. Prevetti stated this information would be provided at the next Task Force meeting.

Task Force member Mike Alvarado commented that on the tour he didn't see many sites where the housing was located next to transportation points. It would be nice to see development ideas where transportation is neutral by design.

Task Force member Ike White asked when the process would allow for discussion of inserting teen amenities. Prevetti said that a point will come when we will insert the amenities onto the properties.

Task Force member Bill Kozlovsky asked if there was information available as to how far people would walk to retail nodes. Prevetti said that staff will do some research but that much of this depends on the design of the streets. If streets are attractive then people are more likely to walk. You rarely see people walking along Capitol Expressway because it is unattractive. Kozlovsky added that the parking at the Evergreen Village Square will need to be expanded if version B is carried out.

Alvarez commented that she walks from the top of Aborn Road down to Lunardi's. She likes taking the paths that cut through the ESP. Task Force member Paul Pereira commented that he walks daily to the Evergreen Village Square. He added that Murillo

Road is such that it encourages speeding and asked if it could be realigned so it shifts easterly, the homes back the sound walls and the streets become more narrow. Prevetti commented that staff would consider this idea.

Task Force member Lou Kvitek commented that version B would be produce approximately 2000 homes and with four people per home, it necessitates the creation of more schools. Task Force member Tom Andrade said that he presumes that included in the facilities to be added to these properties will be schools. Maybe the district will consider a K-8 school. In any case, the district remains ready to participate in any planning efforts. Kvitek added that of particular concern to him is the high school situation.

Alvarado asked what uses were permissible beyond the greenline. Prevetti responded that it depends on the ownership. One can develop one house per lot. Both the City and the Country try to push trail development and the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority uses its revenues to buy key pieces land for preservation of open space and use for recreational purposes only.

Kvitek commented that Montgomery Hill is a large park property but that in newer housing developments the large park concept isn't needed. Is there consideration to grade Montgomery Hill and add something?

Member of the public Marty Shelton commented that he finds that connections and public spaces are often the last pieces to go into developments (i.e. Fowler Creek Park) and he would like to see this put in either before construction or during construction.

Covington asked what would happen to the Dade Behring building. Prevetti responded that one version will assume the building won't exist.

Legaspi asked who would provide the parks facilities? Prevetti responded that this Task Force would help make that decision. Perhaps the group will decide to contribute land, money or both.

Task Force member Vince Songcayawon asked the Task Force to remember that when considering commercial additions to Evergreen, to not limit themselves to retail additions. Services like medical practices are sorely needed in Evergreen, too, so residents don't have to travel across town to access their basic medical needs.

Task Force member Mark Milioto asked that since the Dade Behring building is vacant, couldn't the city buy it? Prevetti said that it's a possibility, that someone private may buy it to develop it. Since likely the vision for the industrial sites is not a research and development usage, maybe the owners will be encouraged to sell.

Task Force member Steve Moore asked if there was any consideration for adding places worship. Prevetti said absolutely.

Cortese brought the discussion of the industrial sites to a conclusion by summarizing what he feels the Task Force now wants to see - they do not want to commit to a density until they see how it matches up with all of our Guiding Principles.

Discussion of Concepts for Arcadia

Prevetti reminded the group that at the 3/10/04 meeting, the Task Force had given several ideas for what they would like to see on this property. This input, along with the charrette plan, is the basis for the four versions being presented today by Manny Gonzalez.

Gonzalez walked the task force through each of the four concepts (A through D) and then opened the floor for questions. Prevetti commented that since it is fairly certain that light rail will proceed along Capitol Expressway, rerouting the line through the Arcadia Property, as depicted in version B, is not likely.

Kvitek asked if it was possible to depict a walking trail from Meadowfair Park to the lightrail station. VTA staff person Julie Render commented that there is some flexibility in moving this station slightly north or south. The engineering study for this overall project will be completed by August and the ultimate station placement may be influenced by the land use decisions going on here today. Kvitek responded that he feels the lightrail station should be moved closer to Nieman Boulevard to allow for a more direct connection from Meadowfair Park.

Alvarado commented that version A shows the most integration with the existing neighborhoods. He would like to see more details with respect to connectivity. He also asked how sure light rail is since it is a linchpin for development in Evergreen.

Cummings asked if the road depicted in version D could connect with Nieman Boulevard.

Cortese commented that version D concerns him because it puts the mixed use right behind the Meadowfair neighborhood. He would prefer mirroring what is in Meadowfair.

Task Force member Maria Lopez asked staff to ensure there are access points from the existing neighborhoods to the public amenities.

White asked how much retail is suggested to be placed here. Prevetti responded that retail study needs to be done to determine what can be supported.

Cortese asked the group if they liked some medium between version B (without light rail running through the center of property) and D. Alvarez commented that she favored D over B because D had more open space and a better flow. Member of the public Kathy Antl commented that she liked the placement of the community center in scenario A because it placed the center near the park. She likes the roadway in version D but doesn't want the street to become a motorist short-cut. Andrade commented that this area is in need of an elementary school but the flight path and power line issue makes its placement challenging. He suggested that perhaps the school will go where the track area is and the track will go where the power line area is.

Task Force member Khanh Nguyen commented that he was opposed to the placement of the community center in the center of the property.

Cortese said that the development community would return with iterations based on today's comments.

III. DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL PUBLIC OUTREACH PLAN

Laurel Prevetti gave a short explanation as to the typical outreach plan for development projects as conducted by the Planning Department. She explained that the development consortium has hired the Tramutola Company to handle the community engagement aspect for this project and asked Bonnie Moss to address the group.

Bonnie Moss asked the group to engage in a brief exercise. She gave each task force member three post-it notes. On the first note she asked members to write down what they would like to see included in the community engagement process. On the second note she asked the members to write down what groups the individual feels must be outreached to with respect to the Visioning Project. On the third note she asked the members to write down what questions they feel will be asked by the community. Moss explained that she would return at the next meeting to go into detail on the proposed outreach strategy for the Evergreen Visioning Project.

IV. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.